<u>REMARKS</u>

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-23, 25-38, and 30-35 are presently pending. Claims 1, 7-10, 19, 25, and 30 are amended. No claims are canceled and no claims are added.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0003] Examiner Charles Lu graciously talked with Trevor Lind—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on December 22, 2008. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0004] During the interview, differences between the claims and the cited art, namely U.S. Patent No. 6,301,579 ("Becker") and U.S. Patent No. 5,903,302 ("Browning") were discussed. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, possible clarifying amendments were proposed.

[0005] The Examiner appeared receptive to the proposals. In particular, the Examiner indicated that reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, may distinguish over the cited art. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0006] Claims have been amended and arguments are presented in this response based on the discussion that occurred during the interview.

Formal Request for an Additional Interview

[0007]   If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an additional interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0008]   Please contact me to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for me, I welcome your call as well. My contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments and Additions

[0009]   Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 7-10, 19, 25, and 30. The claim amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Further, the claim amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed features in response to the cited references.

[0010]   In addition, the claim amendments are fully supported by the Application and do not include new matter. For example, the amendments to claims 1, 10, 19, and 25 are at least supported by paragraph [0056] of the originally filed application. Further, the amendments to claim 30 are at least supported by paragraphs [0052] and [0053] of the originally filed application.

SUBSTANTIVE MATTERS

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0011]   The arguments presented below point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1-23, 25-28, and 30-35 have not been met. For example, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 1-23, 25-28, and 30-35.

Based upon Becker and Browning

[0012]   The Action rejects claims 1, 3-10, 12-19, 21-23, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,301,579 ("Becker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,302 ("Browning"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0013]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 1:

- "reprocessing, at the computing device, a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, wherein the

particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure"

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from a data set. (*See* Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Further, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from the training set, back-fitting the decision table classifier using the data set, and updating the probability estimates of the decision table classifier. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-58) The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach back-fitting a <u>decision table classifier</u> to a larger <u>data set</u> that includes the training data set used to create the decision table classifier in order to improve error estimation and not reprocessing <u>mining models</u> in response to <u>a change</u> in the <u>mining structure</u> used to create the mining models.

[0014]   Further, in contrast to claim 1, the cited portions of Browning teach determining that a configuration file cannot be found during an installation process of automated video call distribution software and recreating the configuration software using programmed defaults. (*See* Browning, col. 5, ll. 25-41). The cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0015] Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Browning does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 3-9

[0016] Dependent claims 3-9 ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 3-9. Accordingly, claims 3-9 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

[0017] Further, at least some of the dependent claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and a mining structure from which each mining model was created, where the links facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 6.

[0018] With respect to claim 6, page 7 of the Action states:

> `**As to claim 6**, Becker as applied above further teaches wherein links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously

reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures. Note that "a structure can be built from a small training set and then be back-fitted with a larger data set to improve the probability estimates" (col. 29, ll. 53-55). In order to accomplish this, a "link" between model and structure must be stored to remember the correspondence between the mining model and mining structure and to update the values correctly.'

However, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created, where changes in one or more mining structures are simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 6. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach building a decision table classifier from a training set and improving the probability estimates of the decision table classifier using the full data set containing the training set. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-65).   There are no changes in Becker that occur with respect to the mining structure/training set, but instead data is merely retrieved from the data set that was used to build the training set. In addition, the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest links between a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created, where changes in one or more mining structures are simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 6. Hence, claim 6 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Independent Claim 10

[0019] Applicant submits that the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 10:

- "reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure"

In contrast to claim 10, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from a data set. (*See* Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Further, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from the training set, back-fitting the decision table classifier using the data set, and updating the probability estimates of the decision table classifier. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-58) The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 10. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach back-fitting a decision table classifier to a larger data set that includes the training data set used to create the decision table classifier in order to improve error estimation and not reprocessing mining models in response to a change in the mining structure used to create the mining models.

[0020]   Further, in contrast to claim 10, the cited portions of Browning teach determining that a configuration file cannot be found during an installation process of automated video call distribution software and recreating the configuration software using programmed defaults. (*See* Browning, col. 5, ll. 25-41).   The cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 10.

[0021]   Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Browning does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 10 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 12-18

[0022]   Dependent claims 12-18 ultimately depend upon independent claim 10. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 10. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 12-18. Accordingly, claims 12-18 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

[0023]   Further, at least some of the dependent claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning. For example, as explained previously with respect to claim 6, the cited art does not teach or suggest links between the one or more of a

plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 15. Hence, claim 15 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Independent Claim 19

[0024]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 19:

- "wherein links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures"

- "reprocessing, at the computing device, a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure"

In contrast to claim 19, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from

a data set. (*See* Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Additionally, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from the training set, back-fitting the decision table classifier using the data set, and updating the probability estimates of the decision table classifier. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-58). The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between one of more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created, where changes in one or more mining structures are simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 19. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach building a decision table classifier from a training set and improving the probability estimates of the decision table classifier using the full data set containing the training set. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-65). There are no changes in Becker that occur with respect to the mining structure/training set, but instead data is merely retrieved from the data set that was used to build the training set. In addition, the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and a mining structure from which each mining model was created, where the links facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 19.

[0025] Further, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was

created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach back-fitting a <u>decision table classifier</u> to a larger <u>data set</u> that includes the training data set used to create the decision table classifier in order to improve error estimation and not reprocessing <u>mining models</u> in response to <u>a change</u> in the <u>mining structure</u> used to create the mining models.

[0026] In addition, in contrast to claim 19, the cited portions of Browning teach determining that a configuration file cannot be found during an installation process of automated video call distribution software and recreating the configuration software using programmed defaults. (*See* Browning, col. 5, ll. 25-41). The cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0027] Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable because the cited combination of Becker and Browning does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 21-23

[0028] Dependent claims 21-23 ultimately depend upon independent claim 19. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions

of Browning do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 19. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 21-23. Accordingly, claims 21-23 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 25

[0029]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 25:

- "wherein links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, facilitating changes relating to discretization of continuous variables associated with the one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures"

- "reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, wherein the particular mining model is created based on the respective mining structure, and wherein the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized"

In contrast to claim 25, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from a data set. (*See* Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Additionally, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from the training set, back-fitting the decision table classifier using the data set, and updating the probability estimates of the decision table classifier. (*See* Becker, col. 29, ll. 49-58). The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and a mining structure from which each mining model was created, where the links facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 25. Rather, the cited portions of Becker merely teach retrieving data from a data set used to create a training set and not links that facilitate changes in a mining structure being reflected in mining models created from the mining structure. Additionally, the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and a mining structure from which each mining model was created are stored, where the links facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 25.

[0030]   Further, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was

created from the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized, as recited in claim 25. Rather, the cited portions of Becker teach back-fitting a <u>decision table classifier</u> to a larger <u>data set</u> that includes the training data set used to create the decision table classifier in order to improve error estimation and not reprocessing <u>mining models</u> in response to <u>a change</u> in the <u>mining structure</u> used to create the mining models. The cited portions of Browning also do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized, as recited in claim 25.

[0031]   Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable because the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 25 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 26-28

[0032]   Dependent claims 26-28 ultimately depend upon independent claim 25. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions

of Browning do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 25. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 26-28. Accordingly, claims 26-28 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Based upon Becker

[0033] The Action rejects claims 19, 21-23, 25-28, 30, and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 19

[0034] As explained previously with respect to claim 19 above, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures. In addition, as explained previously with respect to claim 19 above, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure.

[0035] Accordingly, claim 19 is allowable because the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 21-23

[0036] Dependent claims 21-23 ultimately depend upon independent claim 19. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 19. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 21-23. Accordingly, claims 21-23 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 25

[0037] As explained previously with respect to claim 25 above, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate changes relating to discretization of continuous variables associated with the one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures. In addition, as explained previously with respect to claim 25 above, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change of a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model is

created based on the respective mining structure, and where the particular mining model is reprocessed based on changing a number of ranges into which at least one particular continuous variable associated with the respective mining structure is discretized.

[0038]   Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable because the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 25 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 26-28

[0039]   Dependent claims 26-28 ultimately depend upon independent claim 25. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 25. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 26-28. Accordingly, claims 26-28 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Independent Claim 30

[0040]   Applicant submits that the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest at least the following features of claim 30:

- "wherein a first copy of a particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes the continuous variables of the particular data set discretized in the first manner and a second copy of the particular mining model is created from a respective

data structure that includes the continuous variables of the particular data set discretized in the second manner"

In contrast to claim 30, the cited portions of Becker teach creating a decision table classifier from a training set, where the training set has been created from a data set. (*See* Becker, col. 10, ll. 29-38 and col. 11, ll. 51-67). Further, Becker teaches building decision table classifiers from a single training set. (*See* Becker, col. 12, ll. 50 – col. 13, ll. 53). The cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest that a first copy of a particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes continuous variables of a particular data set discretized in a first manner and a second copy of the particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes continuous variables of the particular data set discretized in a second manner, as recited in claim 30. Rather, Becker teaches building decision table classifiers from a single training set and not building multiple copies of a mining model from a mining structure derived from a particular data set.

[0041]   Accordingly, claim 30 is allowable because the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 30 and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 32-35

[0042]   Dependent claims 32-35 ultimately depend upon independent claim 30. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 30. Thus, the cited art does not teach or suggest all

of the features of claims 32-35. Accordingly, claims 32-35 are allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

[0043]   Further, at least some of the dependent claims include features that are not taught or suggested by the cited portions of Becker. As explained previously with respect to claim 6, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest links between the one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 35. Hence, claim 35 is allowable for these additional reasons.

Based upon Becker, Browning, and Smith

[0044]   The Action rejects claims 2, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Browning and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,591,274 ("Smith"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claim 2

[0045]   Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest

reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0046]   With respect to claim 2 in view of Smith, page 11 of the Action states:

> "**As to claim 2**, Becker/Browning as applied above teaches mining structures, but does not expressly teach "serving as first class objects in a database."
>
> However, Smith teaches serving as first class objects in a database (col. 4, ll. 5-45)."

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Browning. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 1.

[0047]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 11

[0048]   Claim 11 depends from claim 10, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 10.

[0049]   With respect to claim 11 in view of Smith, page 11 of the Action states:

> "**Claims 11 and 20** are drawn to substantially the same subject matter as claim 2 discussed above."

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Browning. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 10.

[0050]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 10, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 11. Accordingly, claim 11 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 20

[0051]   Claim 20 depends from claim 19, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning. As explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 19.   Further, as explained previously, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Browning do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0052]   With respect to claim 20 in view of Smith, page 11 of the Action states:

> "**Claims 11 and 20** are drawn to substantially the same subject matter as claim 2 discussed above."

However, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker and Browning. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate

changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 19. Additionally, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0053]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Based upon Becker and Smith

[0054]   The Action rejects claims 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker in view of Smith. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claim 20

[0055]   Claim 20 depends from claim 19, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Smith. As explained previously with respect to claim 20 above, the cited portions of Becker

and the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest links between one or more of a plurality of mining models and the mining structure from which each mining model was created that facilitate changes in one or more mining structures being simultaneously reflected in each of the one or more mining models created from each of the changed mining structures, as recited in claim 19. In addition, as explained previously with respect to claim 20 above, the cited portions of Becker and the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest reprocessing a particular mining model in response to a change in a respective mining structure in association with a link between the particular mining model and the respective mining structure, where the particular mining model was created from the respective mining structure, as recited in claim 19.

[0056]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 19, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 20. Accordingly, claim 20 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claim 31

[0057]   Claim 31 depends from claim 30, which Applicant has shown to be allowable over the cited portions of Becker. For example, as explained previously, the cited portions of Becker do not teach or suggest that a first copy of a particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes continuous variables of a particular data set discretized in a first manner and a second copy of the particular mining model is created from a respective

data structure that includes continuous variables of the particular data set discretized in a second manner, as recited in claim 30. In addition, the cited portions of Smith do not make up for the deficiencies of Becker. For example, the cited portions of Smith do not teach or suggest a first copy of a particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes continuous variables of a particular data set discretized in a first manner and a second copy of the particular mining model is created from a respective data structure that includes continuous variables of the particular data set discretized in a second manner, as recited in claim 30.

[0058]   Since the cited art does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 30, the cited art also does not teach or suggest each feature of claim 31. Accordingly, claim 31 is allowable and Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

[0059]   All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application.   If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action**.   Please call/email me at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Attorneys for Applicant

/Trevor Lind/_____   Dated: December 30, 2008_____
Trevor Lind (trevor@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162, ext. 5003)
Registration No. 54785
Emmanuel A. Rivera (emmanuel@leeheayes.com; 512-505-8162, ext. 5001)
Registration No. 45760
Customer No. **22801**

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com